

Airport Recovery Project Advisory Committee

Meeting Minutes

Thursday, April 25, 2013

ABAG Conference Room B

1:00 – 3:30 pm

Meeting Minutes, Agendas and Distributed Materials are available online at

http://quake.abag.ca.gov/airport_resilience

Members Present:

Rosalyn Yu, San Francisco Airport

Nancy Okasaki, MTC

Joe Aguilar, Caltrans District 4 Freight Mobility

Bill Cain, EBMUD

Jeanne Perkins, Jeanne Perkins Consulting

Rob Forester, San Francisco Airport

Wendy Goodfriend, BCDC

Nicole Longoria, Caltrans

Diane Heinze, Port of Oakland/Oakland Airport

Jonathan Frisch, PG&E

Colette Armao, Caltrans Division of Aeronautics

Jeff Hoeft, Fugro Consultants, Inc

Robert Braga, Caltrans District 4

Bruce Riordan, Joint Policy Committee

Patrick Tyner, Caltrans

Staff present:

Dana Brechwald

Danielle Hutchings

1. Call to order
2. Introductions/check-in
3. Approval of minutes from last meeting
 - Minutes of January 31, 2013 were approved with no corrections.
4. Project background/schedule update
 - No comments were given on Colette Armao and Danielle Mieler's project update.
5. Discussion of preliminary findings

1. Liquefaction susceptibility assessment at Bay Area airports: draft report

- Rosalyn Wu pointed out that the borings at SFO were not actually on the runway but adjacent, so they may not accurately predict the liquefaction potential of the runways themselves.
- Bob Braga pointed out that the settlement depths given may represent a “best case scenario” estimate given unknowns about deeper soils. This should be presented in the report.
- Bill Cain also expressed concern that uncertainties and limitations be sufficiently addressed in the report (such as lack of boring data or limitations of depths of borings). He said that for accurate planning decisions to be made, users must understand the limitations of the report. Jeff Hoeft agreed to review the report to ensure that limitations and uncertainties are made clear. Jeff also stressed that since the analysis performed for the report is limited that it should be used as a tool to determine if airports wish to do a more detailed study.

2. Role of airports: draft report

- Jeanne Perkins described how the New Orleans airport lost FedEx to Baton Rouge after Hurricane Katrina, but Bob Braga expressed doubt that a similar switch would happen from Oakland to Mather without a thorough economic analysis on the part of FedEx.
- Nancy Okasaki suggested that many recommendations include exercises and training to enhance their usefulness, including recommendations #2, #4, and #5.
- Interest was expressed in the role of accelerometers/ShakeCast to assist in disaster inspection processes (recommendation #9).

3. Oakland International Airport/Bay Farm Island Focus Area Shoreline Resilience

Planning - BCDC Adapting to Rising Tides partnership

- No major comments or questions arose from Wendy Goodfriend’s presentation, though all were interested and appreciative.

4. Infrastructure Interdependencies Study: implementation plan

- The major conversation arose around the scale and selection of scenarios for the interdependencies study. The most salient points are below:

- Which scenario has the greatest impact on the supply chain, since supplies will be necessary for any repair and rebuilding to occur?
- The peninsula is a major choke point for utilities for the region. The rest of the Bay Area generally has redundancies, but the peninsula generally lacks these.
- EBMUD took max ground acceleration from a North/South Hayward scenario and applied it uniformly for all of their assets as a “worst case” proxy.
- One recommendation was to take a single scenario that had the greatest impact on the region and then, for areas that may not be impacted much by the scenario, determine what consequences would be different based on other scenarios.
- RESIN, at UC Berkeley, also struggled with the scale/scenario issue. They moved away from spatial analysis to look at the system operation as a whole and asked what scenario would be most likely to bring down the entire system.
- It was agreed that the actual scenario chosen mattered less than the “story” of the scenario that utility providers would then react to. At the same time, the scenario must be based in science and defensible to make it realistic.
- The scale and scenario largely depend on the end user and how they will use the information.
 - Will counties use this to understand their impacts?
 - Will infrastructure operators use this to inform their own planning?
 - It was suggested that this study and report help codify institutional knowledge between providers to allow them to understand how their systems interact

6. Meeting Debrief

- There was no meeting debrief based on the time – Danielle requested feedback on meeting process via email.

7. Announcements, as requested

- There were no announcements

8. Date of Next Meeting

- The next meeting will be held July 25, 2013.